IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

TT	TOF	TT.	T ~	\sim		T 7 7	
JU		\square			ΗH	EY	

Plaintiff,

v. Case No. 4:17-cv-40

SUN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA,

Defendant.

EXHIBIT A <u>DEFENDANT'S INDEX OF STATE COURT MATTERS</u>

Defendant Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada ("Sun Life"), in connection with the removal of this case to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, and pursuant to Local Rule 81, files this index of state court matters:

	State Court Document	Date
1.	Docket Sheet	01-06-2017
2.	Plaintiff's Original Petition, Request for Disclosure, and Jury Demand	11-22-2016
3.	Civil Process Pick-Up Form	11-29-2016
4.	Citation – Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada	12-19-2016
5.	Affidavit of Service	12-19-2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Bill E. Davidoff

Bill E. Davidoff Texas State Bar No. 00790565 Federal I.D. No. 19513 bill.davidoff@figdav.com

FIGARI + DAVENPORT, LLP 901 Main Street, Suite 3400 Dallas, TX 75202 Tel: 214.939.2000

Fax: 214.939.2000

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT SUN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 12, 2017, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all parties who have appeared and registered with CM/ECF.

/s/ Bill E. Davidoff
Bill E. Davidoff

EXHIBIT "1"

Case 4:17-cv-00040 Document 1-1 Filed in TXSD on 01/09/17 Page 4 of 30

HCDistrictclerk.com

COFFEY, JUSTIN vs. SUN LIFE ASSURANCE

COMPANY OF CANADA

Cause: 201681166 CDI: 7

Court: 151

1/6/2017

DOCUMENTS

Number	Document	Post Date Jdgm	Pgs
73154849	Citation	12/19/2016	1
·> 73154848	Affidavit of Service	12/19/2016	1
73017977	Civil Process Pick-Up Form	11/29/2016	1
72837935	Plaintiffs Original Petition Request for Disclosure and Jury Demand	11/22/2016	19

EXHIBIT "2"

11/22/2016 3:25:16 PM Chris Daniel - District Clerk Harris County Envelope No. 13936660 By: Carla Carrillo Filed: 11/22/2016 3:25:16 PM

2016-81166 / Court: 151

	No	
JUSTIN COFFEY Plaintiff,	§ §	IN THE DISTRICT COURT
V.	<i>\$</i>	JUDICIAL DISTRICT
SUN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA Defendant.	<i>\$\tau\$</i>	HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL PETITION REQUEST FOR DISCLOSURE and JURY DEMAND

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT:

- 1. NOW COMES JUSTIN COFFEY, hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff", and brings this action against SUN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA hereinafter referred to as "Defendant."
- 2. Plaintiff brings this action to secure all disability benefits, whether they be described as short term and/or long term, or life waiver premium benefits to which Plaintiff is entitled under the disability insurance policy underwritten and administered by Defendant.
- 3. Defendant has underwritten and administered the policy and has issued a denial of the benefits claimed under the policy by the Plaintiff. The policy at issue can be identified as Policy Number 228737 for long term disability and waiver of premium.

I. PARTIES

4. Plaintiff is a citizen and resident of Harris County, Texas.

5. Defendant is a properly organized business entity doing business in the State of Texas. Defendant may be served with process by serving its registered agent, C T Corporation System, addressed at 350 North St. Paul Street, Dallas, Texas 75201.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. This is an action for damages for failure to pay benefits under an insurance policy and other related claims over which this court has jurisdiction. Specifically, the Plaintiff is a resident of the state of Texas and Defendant, a foreign corporation is authorized to do business in the State of Texas.
 - 7. The disability policy at issue in the case was issued in the State of Texas.

III. THE CLAIM ON THE POLICY

- 8. Plaintiff has been a covered beneficiary under a group disability benefits policy issued by Defendant at all times relevant to this action. Said policy became effective September 1, 2013.
- 9. Plaintiff is a 44 year old man previously employed as a "High School Music Teacher".
- 10. High School Music Teacher is classified under the Dictionary of Occupational Titles as Light with an SVP of 7 and considered to be skilled work.
- 11. Due to Plaintiff's disabling conditions, Plaintiff ceased actively working on April 2, 2014, as on this date Plaintiff suffered from major depressive disorder, recurrent, severe, and anxiety.
 - 12. Plaintiff alleges that he became disabled on April 3, 2014.
 - 13. Plaintiff filed for short term disability benefits with Defendant.
 - 14 Short term disability benefits were *granted*.

- 15. Plaintiff filed for long term disability and waiver of premium benefits through the plan administered by the Defendant.
- 16. Defendant initially granted Plaintiff's request for long term disability benefits under the Plan.
- 17. Subsequently, Defendant denied further long term disability benefits under the Plan pursuant to a letter to Plaintiff dated December 22, 2014. Said letter allowed Plaintiff 180 days to appeal this decision.
- 18. At the time Defendant denied Plaintiff further long term disability benefits, the disability standard in effect pursuant to the Plan was that Plaintiff must be considered unable to perform his "Own Occupation".
 - 19. If granted the plan would pay monthly benefits of \$2,203.00.
- 20. Plaintiff pursued his administrative remedies set forth in the Plan by requesting administrative review of the denial of benefits.
- 21. Plaintiff timely perfected his administrative appeal pursuant to the Plan by sending letter requesting same to the Defendant.
- 22. Plaintiff submitted additional information including medical records to show that he is totally disabled from the performance of both his own and any other occupation as defined by the Plan.
- 23. On April 29, 2015, Defendant notified Plaintiff that Defendant affirmed its original decision to deny Plaintiff's claim for long term disability and waiver of premium benefits.
- 24. Defendant also notified Plaintiff on April 29, 2015, that Plaintiff had exhausted his administrative remedies.

- 25. Defendant, in its final denial, discounted the opinions of Plaintiff's treating physicians, among others, and the documented limitations from which Plaintiff suffers including the effects of Plaintiff's impairments on his ability to engage in work activities.
 - 26. Plaintiff has now exhausted his administrative remedies.

IV. MEDICAL FACTS

- 27. Plaintiff suffers from multiple medical conditions resulting in both exertional and nonexertional impairments.
- 28. Plaintiff suffers from treatment-resistant major depression, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anxiety, Reynaud's Phenomenon, daytime insomnolence, migraine headaches, swelling and pain in the foot, and restless leg syndrome (RLS).
- 29. Treating physicians document his disabilities and the continued pain that requires ongoing pain management.
- 30. Plaintiff's multiple disorders have resulted in restrictions in activity, and have significantly curtailed his ability to engage in any form of exertional activity.
- 31. Further, Plaintiff's physical impairments have resulted in chronic pain and discomfort.
- 32. Plaintiff's treating physicians document these symptoms. Plaintiff does not assert that he suffers from said symptoms based solely on his own subjective allegations.
- 33. Physicians have prescribed Plaintiff with multiple medications, including narcotic pain relievers, in an effort to address his multiple symptoms.
 - 34. However, Plaintiff continues to suffer from breakthrough pain, discomfort,

and limitations in functioning, as documented throughout the administrative record.

- 35. Plaintiff's documented pain is so severe that it impairs his ability to maintain the pace, persistence and concentration required to maintain competitive employment on a full time basis, meaning an 8 hour day, day after day, week after week, month after month.
- 36. Plaintiff's medications cause additional side effects in the form of sedation and cognitive difficulties.
- 37. The aforementioned impairments and their symptoms preclude Plaintiff's performance of any work activities on a consistent basis.
- 38. As such, Plaintiff has been and remains disabled per the terms of the Policy and has sought disability benefits pursuant to said Policy.
- 39. However, after exhausting his administrative remedies, Defendant persists in denying Plaintiff his rightfully owed disability benefits.

V. Defendant's Unfair Claims Handling Practices

- 40. On or about July 14, 2014, Defendant's internal vocational consultant, Bruce Hoffman, M.Ed., LPC, CRC, rehabilitation case consultant, performed a paper review of Plaintiff's claim file. Despite admitting to using a job description that does not specifically quantify the physical demands of his job, Mr. Hoffman produced a report upon which the Defendant relied.
- 41. On or about April 21, 2014, Defendant's paid consultant, Scarline Jerome-Kon, M.D., psychiatry, performed a peer review of Plaintiff's claim file.

- 42. Dr. Jerome-Kon's report is misleading, biased and result driven in that the doctor failed to review all relevant medical records, the report ignores or is contrary to controlling medical authority such as American College of Mental Health Administration. The report fails to specify the medical standard upon which it relies. The report is based on faulty or incorrect information
- 43. Further, Dr. Jerome-Kon failed to consider all the claimant's illnesses. The doctor failed to consider all the claimant's illnesses in combination. The report is conclusory and results driven, as demonstrated by the fact that the report cherry-picks the information by overemphasizing information that supports the insurer's position and de-emphasizing information that supports disability and the report does not consider the standard of disability specified in the policy.
- 44. On or about July 23, 2014, Defendant's internal consultant, Megan St. Germain, Nurse Consultant, performed a paper review of Plaintiff's claim file.
- 45. Defendant, with a pre-determined agenda to find Plaintiff not disabled, relies on a biased report from Ms. St. Germain. Defendant in bad faith, relies on a non-treating physician, who has not conducted a physical examination of Plaintiff, over Plaintiff's treating physician who has examined Plaintiff over a long and frequent period of time, and with more knowledge of Plaintiff's condition.
- 46. Defendant has failed to consider Plaintiff's credible complaints of pain and fatigue which limit Plaintiff's ability to function.
- 47. Defendant has selectively reviewed Plaintiff's medical records and has cherry-picked only the excerpts from the medical records that support its predetermined conclusion that Plaintiff is not disabled.

- 48. Defendant has failed to consider the side effects of Plaintiff's medication.
- 49. Defendant's consultants completed their reports without examining Plaintiff.
- 50. On April 29, 2015, Defendant notified Plaintiff that Defendant affirmed its original decision to deny Plaintiff's claim for long term disability benefits.
- 51. Defendant also notified Plaintiff on April 29, 2015 that Plaintiff had exhausted his administrative remedies.
- 52. Defendant, in its final denial, discounted the opinions of Plaintiff's treating physicians, among others, and the documented limitations from which Plaintiff suffers including the effects of Plaintiff's impairments on his ability to engage in work activities.
- 53. At all relevant times, Defendant has been operating under an inherent and structural conflict of interest as Defendant is liable for benefit payments due to Plaintiff and each payment depletes Defendant's assets.
 - 54. Defendant's determination was influenced by its conflict of interest.
- 55. Defendant has failed to take active steps to reduce potential bias and to promote accuracy of its benefits determinations.
- 56. The LTD plan gave Defendant the right to have Plaintiff submit to a physical examination at the appeal level.
- 57. A physical examination, with a full file review, provides an evaluator with more information than a medical file review alone.
 - 58. More information promotes accurate claims assessment,
- 59. Despite having the right to a physical examination, Defendant did not ask Plaintiff to submit to one.

60. Defendant's conduct as a whole has failed to furnish a full and fair review of Plaintiff's claim.

VI. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

Breach of Contract

- 61. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 60 of this Petition as if set forth herein.
- 62. Under the terms of the Plan, Defendant is obligated to pay Plaintiff benefits, in full and without reservations of rights, during the period of time that Plaintiff is suffering totally disabled, as those words are defined in the Plan.
- 63. In breach of its obligations under the aforementioned Plan, Defendant has failed to pay Plaintiff benefits in full and without any reservations of rights during the period of time that Plaintiff is suffering "totally disabled," as those words are defined in the Plan.
- 64. Defendant stopped paying benefits to Plaintiff under the Plan, despite the fact that Plaintiff was totally disabled, in that he cannot perform the material duties of his own occupation, and he cannot perform the material duties of any other occupation which his medical condition, education, training, or experience would reasonably allow.
- 65. Defendant breached the Plan when it stopped paying benefits to Plaintiff, despite the fact that Plaintiff was suffering totally disability, as that phrase is defined in the Plan. Defendant has violated its contractual obligation to furnish disability benefits to Plaintiff.
- 66. Plaintiff has complied with all Policy provisions and conditions precedent to qualify for benefits prior to filing suit.

- 67. As a result of Defendant's breach, Plaintiff suffered financial hardship.
- 68. By reason of the foregoing, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for damages.

VII. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:

Violations of Texas Insurance Code & DTPA

- 69. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates each allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 68 of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.
- 70. Due to the aforementioned acts and omissions, Defendant has violated the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act sections and articles in the following ways:
 - (a) Insurance Code Article § 541.051 by misrepresenting the terms or benefits and advantages of The Policy;
 - (b) Insurance Code Article § 541.052 by placing before the public materials containing untrue, deceptive, or misleading assertions, representations, or statements regarding The Policy;
 - (c) Insurance Code Article § 541.060 by engaging in unfair settlement practices by (1) misrepresenting to Plaintiff a material fact or policy provision relating to the coverage at issue; (2) failing to attempt in good faith to effectuate a prompt, fair, and equitable settlement of a claim with respect to which Defendant's liability has become reasonably clear; (3) failing to promptly provide to Plaintiff a reasonable explanation of the basis in The Policy, in relation to the facts or applicable law, for Defendant's denial of Plaintiff's claim; (4) failing within a reasonable time to affirm or deny coverage of

- Plaintiff's claim; and (5) refusing to pay a claim without conducting a reasonable investigation with respect to the claim;
- (d) Insurance Code Article § 541.061 by misrepresenting The Policy by

 (1) making an untrue statement of material fact; (2) failing to state a

 material fact necessary to make other statements made not
 misleading, considering the circumstances under which the
 statements were made; (3) making a statement in such a manner
 as to mislead a reasonably prudent person to a false conclusion of
 a material fact; (4) making a material misstatement of law; and (5)
 failing to disclose other matters required by law to be disclosed.
- (e) Business and Commerce Code § 17.46(b)(5) by representing that services had characteristics, uses and benefits that they did not have;
- (f) Business and Commerce Code § 17.46(b)(12) by representing that an agreement conferred or involved rights, remedies or obligations which it did not have or involve; and
- (g) Business and Commerce Code § 17.46(b)(24) by failing to disclose information concerning services which was known at the time of the transaction where the failure to disclose such information was intended to induce Plaintiff into a transaction into which Plaintiff would not have entered had the information been disclosed.
- (h) Plaintiff is totally disabled, in that he cannot perform the material duties of his own occupation, and he cannot perform the material

- duties of any other occupation which his medical condition, education, training, or experience would reasonably allow;
- (i) Defendant failed to afford proper weight to the evidence in the administrative record showing that Plaintiff is totally disabled;
- (j) Defendant's interpretation of the definition of disability contained in the policy is contrary to the plain language of the policy, as it is unreasonable, arbitrary, and capricious;
- (k) Defendant failed to furnish Plaintiff a Full and Fair Review;
- (I) Defendant failed to specify information necessary to perfect Plaintiff's appeal;
- (m) Defendant has denied Plaintiff based on a selective and incomplete review of the records;
- (n) Defendant failed to credit Plaintiff's treating doctor's opinion;
- (o) Defendant has wrongfully terminated Plaintiff's LTD benefits without evidence of improvement;
- (p) Defendant's request for objective evidence was improper;
- (q) Defendant failed to credit Plaintiff's credible complaints of pain and fatigue;
- (r) Defendant failed to consider the side effects of Plaintiff's medications;
- (s) Defendant has wrongfully relied on a reviewing doctor's opinion who failed to consider Plaintiff's occupation and/or vocational abilities;

- (t) Defendant failed to give Plaintiff an opportunity to respond to new evidence;
- (u) Defendant's objective is to terminate Plaintiff's claim which is contrary to its duty as a fiduciary to act in good faith;
- (v) Defendant has violated its contractual obligation to furnish disability benefits to Plaintiff; and
- (w) Defendant failed to adopt and implement reasonable standards for prompt investigation of claims arising under its policies.
- 71. Defendant knowingly committed the foregoing acts, with actual knowledge of the falsity, unfairness, or deception of the foregoing acts and practices, in violation of Texas Insurance Code section 541.002 (1) (formerly Art. 21.21 §2(c)).

VIII. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:

Breach of Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing

- 72. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 71 of this Petition as if set forth herein.
- 73. By selling the insurance policy to Plaintiff and by collecting substantial premiums therefore, Defendant assumed a duty of good faith and fair dealing toward Plaintiff.
- 74. The Plan contains an implied promise that it would deal fairly and in good faith with Plaintiff and would do nothing to injure, frustrate, or interfere with Plaintiff's rights to receive benefits und the Plan.
- 75. Defendant breached its duty of good faith and fair dealing toward Plaintiff in one or more of the following ways:

- (a) By failing to pay benefits to Plaintiff when Defendant knew or reasonably should have known that Plaintiff was entitled to such benefits;
- (b) By interpreting ambiguous Plan provisions against Plaintiff and in favor of its own financial interests;
- (c) By interpreting the factual circumstances of Plaintiff's disability condition against Plaintiff and in favor of its own financial interests;
- (d) By failing to afford proper weight to the evidence in the administrative record showing that Plaintiff is totally disabled, including several determinations from Plaintiff's treating physician,
- (e) By misrepresenting Plan coverage, conditions, exclusions, and other provisions;
- (f) By interpreting the definition of disability contained in the Plan contrary to the plain language of the Policy and in an unreasonable, arbitrary, and capricious manner;
- (g) By failing to provide a reasonable explanation of the basis for the denial of disability benefits to Plaintiff; and
- (h) By compelling Plaintiff to initiate this action to obtain the benefits to which Plaintiff was entitled under the Plan.
- 76. By reason of Defendant's wrongful acts in breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, Plaintiff suffered financial hardship, substantial emotional duress, mental anguish, and pain and suffering which exacerbated his depression and anxiety.
 - 77. The actions of Defendant amount to egregious tortuous conduct directed

at Plaintiff, a consumer of insurance.

- 78. Defendant's actions directed at Plaintiff are part of a pattern of similar conduct directed at the public generally.
- 79. Defendant's actions were and are materially misleading and have caused injury to Plaintiff.
- 80. Defendant carelessly relied on its own flawed review of the records instead of in person medical examinations to decide to discontinue paying benefits.
- 81. By reason of Defendant's wrongful acts in breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for compensatory damages and, for its egregious tortuous conduct, punitive damages, and attorneys' fees, costs, and disbursements incurred in connection with this action.

IX. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Fraud

- 82. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates each allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 81 of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.
- 83. Defendant acted fraudulently as to each representation made to Plaintiff concerning material facts for the reason it would not have acted and which Defendant knew were false or made recklessly without any knowledge of their truth. The representations were made with the intention that they be acted upon by Plaintiff, who relied on those representations, thereby causing injury and damage to Plaintiff.

X. FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Prompt Payment of Claim

84. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates each allegation contained in

Paragraphs 1 through 83 of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.

- 85. Defendant failed to timely request from Plaintiff any additional items, statements or forms that Defendant reasonably believed to be required from Plaintiff, in violation of Texas Insurance Code section 542.055 (a)(2)-(3).
- 86. Defendant failed to notify Plaintiff in writing of the acceptance or rejection of the claim not later than the fifteenth business day after receipt of all items, statements, and forms required by Defendant in violation of Texas Insurance Code section 542.056(a).
- 87. Defendant delayed payment of Plaintiff's claim in violation of Texas Insurance Code section 542.058(a).

XI. SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Statutory Interest

- 88. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates each allegation contained in Paragraphs 1 through 87 of this Petition as if fully set forth herein.
- 89. Plaintiff makes a claim for penalties of 18% statutory interest on the amount of the claim along with reasonable attorneys' fees for violation of Texas Insurance Code Subchapter B pursuant to Texas Insurance Code section 542.060.

XII. CAUSATION

90. The conduct described in this petition was a producing and proximate cause of damages to Plaintiff.

XIII. DECLARATORY RELIEF

91. Pleading further, Plaintiff would show he is entitled to declaratory relief pursuant to Section 37 of the Texas Civil Practices and Remedies Code. Specifically,

Plaintiff would show that he is entitled to declaratory relief due to (DEFENDANT)'s breach of its contractual obligation under the terms of The Policy. TEX. CIV. PRACT. & REM. CODE § 37.001.

- 92. The evidence at trial will show that Plaintiff submitted a timely and properly payable claim for LTD benefits to Defendant. The evidence will show that Defendant denied Plaintiff benefits which it contractually owes, because it claims that Plaintiff's condition does not meet The Policy's definition of "disabled".
- 93. The conduct of Defendant as described above creates uncertainty and insecurity with respect to Plaintiff's rights, status, and other legal relations with Defendant. Therefore, Plaintiff requests the Court exercise its power afforded under §37.001 et. seq. of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code and declare the specific rights and statuses of the parties herein. Specifically, Plaintiff requests this Court review the facts and attending circumstances and declare that he is disabled as that term is both commonly understood and as defined by the insurance contract made the basis of this suit.

IX. ATTORNEYS FEES

94. Plaintiff prays that the Court award costs and reasonable and necessary attorney's fees as are equitable and just under §37.009 of the Texas Civil Practices and Remedies Code, §38.001 of the Texas Civil Practices and Remedies Code, and Section 542 of the Texas Insurance Code.

X. REQUEST FOR DISCLOSURE

95. Pursuant to Rule 194 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff requests that Defendant disclose, within 50 days of the service of this request, the

information or material described in Rule 194.2 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

XI. JURY DEMAND

96. In accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38, Plaintiff requests a trial by jury of all issues raised in this civil action that are triable by right (or choice) by a jury.

XII. KNOWLEDGE

97. Each of the actions described herein were done "knowingly" as that term is used in the Texas Insurance Code and were a producing cause of Plaintiff's damages.

XIII. RESULTING LEGAL DAMAGES

- 98. Plaintiff is entitled to the actual damages resulting from Defendant's violations of the law. These damages include the consequential damages to his/her economic welfare from the wrongful denial and delay of benefits; the mental anguish and physical suffering resulting from this wrongful denial of benefits; and continued impact on Plaintiff; lost credit reputation; and the other actual damages permitted by law. In addition, Plaintiff is entitled to exemplary damages.
- 99. As a result of Defendant's acts and/or omissions, Plaintiff has sustained damages in excess of the minimum jurisdictional limits of this Court.
- 100. Plaintiff is entitled under law to the recovery of prejudgment interest at the maximum legal rate.
- 101. Defendant's knowing violations of the Texas Insurance Code and DTPA entitle Plaintiff to the attorneys' fees, treble damages, and other penalties provided by law.

- 102. Plaintiff is entitled to statutory interest on the amount of his claim at the rate of 18% per year as damages under Texas Insurance Code section 542.060(a).
- 103. Plaintiff is also entitled to the recovery of attorneys' fees pursuant to Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code section 38.001, Texas Insurance Code section 542.060(a)(b), Texas Business & Commerce Code section 17.50, and Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code section 37.009.

XIV. PRAYER

- 104. WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Plaintiff respectfully prays that the Court GRANT Plaintiff declaratory and injunctive relief, finding that he/she is entitled to all past due short term and long term disability benefits and waiver of premiums benefits yet unpaid under the terms of the Plan, and that Defendant be ordered to pay all future short term and long term disability benefits and waiver of premium benefits according to the terms of the Plan until such time as Plaintiff is no longer disabled or reaches the benefit termination age of the Plan.
- 105. Enter an order awarding Plaintiff all reasonable actual and punitive damages, pre- and post-judgment interest as allowed by law, attorney fees, costs of suit and expenses incurred as a result of Defendant's wrongful denial in providing coverage, and;
 - 106. Enter an award for such other relief as may be just and appropriate.

Dated: 11/22/16

Respectfully submitted,

MARC WHITEHEAD & ASSOCIATES, ATTORNEYS AT LAW L.L.P.

By: /s/ Marc Whitehead

Marc S. Whitehead

Tex. Bar No. 00785238

Fed. I.D. Bar No. 15465

marc@marcwhitehead.com

J. Anthony Vessel

Tex. Bar. No. 24084019

Fed. I.D. No. 1692384

anthony@marcwhitehead.com

Britney Anne Heath McDonald

Tex. Bar. No. 24083158

Fed. I.D. Bar No. 2621983

britney@marcwhitehead.com

5300 Memorial Drive, Suite 725

Houston, Texas 77007

Telephone: 713-228-8888

Facsimile: 713-225-0940

ATTORNEY-IN-CHARGE

FOR PLAINTIFF, JUSTIN COFFEY

EXHIBIT "3"





CHRIS DANIEL

HARRIS COUNTY DISTRICT CLERK

Civil Process Pick-Up Form

VERIFIED TO

	CAUSE N	UMBER: _─	10/68116	16	
ATY_	\mathcal{D}	CIV		COURT_	151
		STING ATTORN			
ATTO	ORNEY: Whith	ul Mace	PH: _	115 2	<u>8-M</u>
CIVII	L PROCESS SERVER				
PH:			Enderl	- hou	em cil
PERSO DATE	ON NOTIFIED SVC REAL	or: WC 11,2976			
Fype of	Service Document: (.}	Tracking Nu	mber 7 3	315303
	Service Document:		Tracking Nu		
Type of	Service Document:		Tracking Nu	mber	
	Service Document:		Tracking Nu	mber	
	Service Document:		Tracking Nu		
	Service Document:		Tracking Nu		
Type of	Service Document:		Tracking Nu	mber	
Process	papers prepared by:	Wanda Cl	hambers		
Date•	17-29-100 20	16 30 days	waiting <i>1</i> 2	29 1	12
		in ovaljs	<u> </u>		
Process	s papers released to:	(PRĮ	ATNAME)	Aif	
(CONTA	CT NUMBER)	(SIG	NATURE)		
Proces	s papers released by:	PAFAE)	Upit, we	2	
	_	LAC Ma	utia		
	17/	(SIG	NATUR SO	3	B

EXHIBIT "4"

Case 4:17-cv-00040 Document 1-1 Filed in TXSD on 01/09/17

12/19/2016 5:34:00 PM **Chris Daniel - District Clerk Harris County** Envelope No: 14366899 By: GONZALEZ, VERONICA Filed: 12/19/2016 5:34:00 PM

201681166 CAUSE NO.

RECEIPT NO.

0.00

ATY

TR # 73315303

PLAINTIFF: COFFEY, JUSTIN

DEFENDANT: SUN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA

151st In The Judicial District Court of Harris County, Texas

151ST DISTRICT COURT Houston, TX

CITATION

THE STATE OF TEXAS County of Harris

TO: SUN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA BY SERVING ITS REGISTERED AGENT

C T CORPORATION SYSTEM

350 NORTH ST PAUL STREET DALLAS TX 75201

Attached is a copy of PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL PETITION REQUEST FOR DISCLOSURE AND JURY DEMAND

This instrument was filed on the 22nd day of November, 2016, in the above cited cause number and court. The instrument attached describes the claim against you.

YOU HAVE BEEN SUED, You may employ an attorney. If you or your attorney do not file a written answer with the District Clerk who issued this citation by 10:00 a.m on the Monday next following the expiration of 20 days after you were served this citation and petition, a default judgment may be taken against you.

TO OFFICER SERVING:

This citation was issued on 29th day of November, 2016, under my hand and seal of said Court. OF HARAGO

Issued at request of: WHITEHEAD, MARC STANLEY 5300 MEMORIAL DRIVE, SUITE 725

HOUSTON, TX 77007 Tel: (713) 228-8888 Bar No.: 785238

CHRIS DANIEL, District Clerk Harris County, Texas 201 Caroline, Houston, Texas 77002 (P.O. Box 4651, Houston, Texas 77210)

Generated By: CHAMBERS, WANDA RENEE ULW//10547399

	OFF	ICER/AUTHORIZ	ED PERSON RETUR	N	
ame to hand at	o'clockM	., on the	day of		
xecuted at (address)	·				in
	_ County at	o'clock	M., on the _	day of _	
, by delivering	to			defendant,	in person, a
crue copy of this Cita	tion together	with the acco	ompanying	copy(ies) of	the Petition
attached thereto and I To certify which I aff					
?EE: \$			·		
			of		County, Texas
		_	Ву		
Affiant				Domistr	

EXHIBIT "5"

12/19/2016 5:33:42 PM Chris Daniel - District Clerk Harris County
Envelope No. 14366899
By: VERONICA GONZALEZ
Filed: 12/19/2016 5:33:42 PM

151st District Court of HARRIS County, Texas

201 CAROLINE, 11 FL HOUSTON TX 77002

CASE #: 201681166

JUSTIN COFFEY

Plaintiff

vs

SUN LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA

Defendant

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

I, PAIGE BRADDOCK, make statement to the fact;
That I am a competent person more than 18 years of age or older and not a party to
this action, nor interested in outcome of the suit. That I received the documents stated
below on 12/19/16 3:00 pm, instructing for same to be delivered upon Sun Life Assurance Of
Canada By Delivering To It's Registered Agent CT Corporation System.

That I delivered to : Sun Life Assurance Of Canada By Delivering To It's

Registered Agent CT Corporation System. By Delivering to Terrie

Thongsavat, Corp Ops Spec

the following : CITATION; PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL PETITION REQUEST FOR

DISCLOSURE AND JURY DEMAND

at this address : 1999 Bryan Street, Suite 900

Dallas, Dallas County, TX 75201

Manner of Delivery : by PERSONALLY delivering the document(s) to the person

above.

Delivered on : Monday December 19, 2016 3:30 pm

My name is PAIGE BRADDOCK, my date of birth is July 13th, 1990, and my address is Professional Civil Process Dallas, Inc., 2300 Valley View Lm, Ste 612, Irving TX 75062, and U.S.A. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Dallas County, State of Texas, on the _____ day of

PAIGE BRADDOC

Declarant

2274

Texas Certification#: SCH-12155 Exp. 07/31/19

PCP Inv#: D16C00556 SO Inv#: A16C02606

+

+ Service Fee: 70.00 Witness Fee: .00

Mileage Fee: .00

Whitehead, Marc

E-FILE RETURN